

# ON THE NUMBER OF PRIMES LESS THAN OR EQUAL $x$

HAROLD N. SHAPIRO

In the beginnings of the theory of the distribution of prime numbers the unique factorization of  $x!$  is found to be

$$(1) \quad x! = \prod_{p \leq x} p^{\alpha_p}$$

where

$$\alpha_p = \left[ \frac{x}{p} \right] + \left[ \frac{x}{p^2} \right] + \cdots .$$

Taking the logarithm of both sides of (1) and using the very elementary result

$$(2) \quad \log x! = x \log x + O(x)$$

there results (see [1, pp. 72, 98])<sup>1</sup>

$$(3) \quad \sum_{p \leq x} \left[ \frac{x}{p} \right] \log p = x \log x + O(x).$$

Since  $[x/p] = [[x]/p]$ , it is clear that (3) then holds for all real  $x > 0$ .

We propose to show in this note that the order of  $\pi(x)$  = the number of primes less than or equal  $x$  (a result originally due to Tschebyschef, cf. [1]) may be derived very quickly from (3) as a consequence of a general theorem which has no particular relationship to prime numbers. This is of some further interest in that Landau, in [1, p. 82], says effectively that (3) does not suffice to give Tschebyschef's theorem. Our general theorem, which is in the nature of a weak Tauberian theorem, is as follows.

**THEOREM.** *Let  $a_n \geq 0$  be a sequence of real numbers such that*

$$(4) \quad A(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \left[ \frac{x}{n} \right] a_n = x \log x + O(x).$$

*Then for  $S(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} a_n$  there exist two positive constants  $\alpha, \beta$ , such that for all sufficiently large  $x$*

$$(5) \quad \beta x \geq S(x) \geq \alpha x.$$

**PROOF.** Since  $[z] - 2[z/2] \geq 0$  for all positive  $z$ , we have from (4)

Received by the editors February 22, 1949 and, in revised form, April 3, 1949.

<sup>1</sup> Numbers in brackets refer to the reference cited at the end of the paper.

$$\begin{aligned} O(x) &= A(x) - 2A\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) = \sum_{n \leq x} \left\{ \left[ \frac{x}{n} \right] - 2 \left[ \frac{x}{2n} \right] \right\} a_n \\ &\geq \sum_{x/2 < n \leq x} \left[ \frac{x}{n} \right] a_n = \sum_{x/2 < n \leq x} a_n = S(x) - S\left(\frac{x}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus for some positive  $K_1$  we have  $0 \leq S(x) - S(x/2) < K_1 x$ . Then  $0 \leq S(x/2^i) - S(x/2^{i+1}) < K_1 x/2^i$ , from which we obtain via addition  $S(x) < 2K_1 x$ . Taking  $\beta = 2K_1$  yields the upper bound in (5).

Having proved that  $S(x) = O(x)$  we return to (4) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq x} \left[ \frac{x}{n} \right] a_n &= \sum_{n \leq x} a_n \left\{ \frac{x}{n} + O(1) \right\} = x \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{a_n}{n} + O(S(x)) \\ &= x \log x + O(x) \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$(6) \quad T(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{a_n}{n} = \log x + O(1).$$

Thus we can write  $T(x) = \log x + R(x)$  where  $|R(x)| \leq K_2$  for all sufficiently large  $x$ . Choosing  $\alpha = e^{-2K_2-1}$ , we have

$$T(x) - T(\alpha x) = \sum_{\alpha x < n \leq x} \frac{a_n}{n} = \log \frac{1}{\alpha} + R(x) - R(\alpha x).$$

From this we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\alpha x} S(x) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha x} \sum_{\alpha x < n \leq x} a_n \geq \log \frac{1}{\alpha} - 2K_2 = 1$$

or

$$S(x) \geq \alpha x,$$

as desired. This completes the proof of the theorem.

In order to apply the above theorem to (3) we take

$$a_n = \begin{cases} \log n & \text{if } n \text{ is a prime,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

so that (4) reduces to (3). Then the theorem gives that for  $\theta(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \log p$ , we have two positive constants  $\alpha, \beta$ , such that

$$\beta x \geq \theta(x) \geq \alpha x.$$

From the obvious inequalities

$$\{\pi(x) - \pi(x^{1/2})\} \log x^{1/2} \leq \theta(x) \leq \pi(x) \log x,$$

Tschebyschef's theorem

$$\alpha \frac{x}{\log x} \leq \pi(x) \leq \gamma \frac{x}{\log x}$$

now follows at once.

#### REFERENCE

1. E. Landau, *Handbuch der Lehre von der Verteilung der Primzahlen*, vol. 1.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

---

## THE RADICAL OF A NON-ASSOCIATIVE RING

W. E. JENNER

In this paper a definition is proposed for the radical of a non-associative ring. Our results are somewhat similar to those given for algebras by Albert in [3],<sup>1</sup> but the difficulties that arose in the earlier theory from absolute divisors of zero have been overcome. With slight modifications, the present proofs are applicable to algebras.

A *non-associative ring*  $\mathfrak{R}$  is an additive abelian group closed under a product operation with respect to which the two distributive laws hold. Multiplication on the right (left) by a fixed element  $x \in \mathfrak{R}$  determines an endomorphism  $R_x$  ( $L_x$ ) of  $\mathfrak{R}$  as an additive group. For  $x, y \in \mathfrak{R}$ ,

$$x \cdot y = xR_y = yL_x.$$

The  $R_x$  and  $L_y$  generate an associative ring  $\mathfrak{A}$  called the *transformation ring* of  $\mathfrak{R}$ . Clearly  $\mathfrak{R}$  can be construed as a representation space for  $\mathfrak{A}$ , and this representation is faithful. The two-sided ideals of  $\mathfrak{R}$ , which are defined as for associative rings, are exactly the  $\mathfrak{A}$ -subspaces of  $\mathfrak{R}$ . The theory of ring homomorphisms goes over intact to the non-associative case.

A nonzero element  $a \in \mathfrak{R}$  is called an *absolute divisor of zero* if  $a \cdot x = x \cdot a = 0$  for all  $x \in \mathfrak{R}$ . If  $\mathfrak{A}$  has a unit element  $I$  and  $\mathfrak{R}$  contains no absolute divisors of zero, then the unit element  $I$  is the identity

---

Received by the editors March 19, 1949.

<sup>1</sup> Numbers in brackets refer to the references cited at the end of the paper.